

No. 18896

United States  
Court of Appeals  
for the Ninth Circuit.

EVELYN KASSAB,

Petitioner,

v

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

Respondent.

PETITIONER'S OPENING BRIEF

FILED

DEC 18 1963

FRANK H. SCHMID, CLERK

MURRAY M. CHOTINER  
PATRICK J. HILLINGS

Suite 600  
202 S. Hamilton Drive  
Beverly Hills, Calif.

Attorneys for Petitioner



TOPICAL INDEX

	<u>PAGE</u>
JURISDICTION OF THE COURT .....	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	2
SPECIFICATION OF ERRORS .....	3
ARGUMENT .....	4
CONCLUSION .....	7
CERTIFICATION .....	7
APPENDIX .....	8

[STATUTE CITED]

8 USC, § 1105a.....	1
---------------------	---



No. 18896

United States  
Court of Appeals  
for the Ninth Circuit.

EVELYN KASSAB,

Petitioner,

v

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

Respondent.

PETITIONER'S OPENING BRIEF

JURISDICTION OF THE COURT

The jurisdiction of this Court is based on 8 USC, § 1105a, as amended. The United States Court of Appeals has exclusive jurisdiction over a petition for review of an order of deportation. The venue shall be in the judicial circuit in which

---

[Pet. designates Petition for Review; TR. designates Transcript of Record.]

1911

STATE OF  
NEW YORK

IN SENATE

JANUARY 11, 1911.

REPORT

OF THE

COMMISSIONERS OF THE LAND OFFICE  
AND THE STATE ENGINEERS

FOR THE YEAR

ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1910.

ALBANY: THE STATE PRINTING OFFICE

The Commission on the part of the State of New York, and the State Engineers on the part of the State of New York, have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the report of the Commissioners of the Land Office and the State Engineers for the year ending December 31, 1910, and to express their appreciation of the thoroughness and accuracy of the same.

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary of State

the administrative proceedings were conducted or the residence of the petitioner.

Petitioner at all times concerned in these proceedings has been a resident of the County of Los Angeles and the proceedings before the Special Inquiry Officer were had in Los Angeles, California. [TR. pp. 44-47; 56; Pet. p. 2].

Petitioner duly took an appeal to the Board of Immigration Appeals seeking to vacate the Order of Deportation issued against her and asked that the matter be remanded to the District Director; on August 16, 1963 the Board of Immigration Appeals made an Order dismissing the appeal. [TR. pp. 3-5].

#### STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner is a native of Iraq and citizen of Israel, who was admitted to the United States on or about July 23, 1958 in the status of a non-immigrant going in transit through the United States. [TR. p. 6].

On November 12, 1958 her status was adjusted to a permanent resident of the United States and on March 13, 1962 her status as a permanent resident was rescinded by the District Director of the Immigration Service at Los Angeles. [TR. p. 6].

An appeal was taken to the Regional Commissioner who on May 7, 1962 affirmed the revocation decision of the

The administrative provisions were promulgated on the 10th day of the month.

Referred to in the above-mentioned administrative provisions

was that a provision of the Council of the Republic and the

provisionary articles of the Council of the Republic were not to

be applied to the Council of the Republic.

Referred to in the above-mentioned administrative provisions

was that a provision of the Council of the Republic and the

provisionary articles of the Council of the Republic were not to

be applied to the Council of the Republic.

Referred to in the above-mentioned administrative provisions

was that a provision of the Council of the Republic and the

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

Referred to in the above-mentioned administrative provisions

was that a provision of the Council of the Republic and the

provisionary articles of the Council of the Republic were not to

be applied to the Council of the Republic.

Referred to in the above-mentioned administrative provisions

was that a provision of the Council of the Republic and the

provisionary articles of the Council of the Republic were not to

be applied to the Council of the Republic.

Referred to in the above-mentioned administrative provisions

was that a provision of the Council of the Republic and the

provisionary articles of the Council of the Republic were not to



District Director and dismissed the appeal. [TR. p. 7].

Exhibit 6, introduced at the hearing before the Special Inquiry Officer, was a letter from the District Director dated May 16, 1962 addressed to the petitioner to the effect that the appeal was denied and stated THERE WAS NO FURTHER APPEAL AVAILABLE (emphasis ours). [TR. pp. 64-65; 87].

At the hearing before the Special Inquiry Officer, Petitioner through her counsel attacked the validity of the rescission proceedings and sought to show that the conclusion reached was in error in that petitioner was in fact entitled to her permanent resident status. This was denied to petitioner by the Special Inquiry Officer. [TR. pp. 74-75].

#### SPECIFICATION OF ERRORS

1. The Immigration Service committed error when it informed petitioner that "there is no further appeal available," when she was entitled to judicial review.

2. The Special Inquiry Officer erred in denying to petitioner the opportunity of showing that she was entitled to her permanent resident status.



ARGUMENT

Petitioner is 27 years of age living with her husband and minor child in Los Angeles County, the child having been born in Los Angeles, thereby being a natural born citizen of the United States. [Pet. p. 2].

When the Immigration Service informed petitioner on May 16, 1962 that her appeal was denied and that "there is no further appeal available", she relied on it. The result was she did not have the opportunity to have the matter passed on by the courts to determine if the decisions of the District Director and the ruling of the Regional Commissioner were correct or justified.

In view of all of the circumstances of the case, petitioner should have been allowed the opportunity of showing that the conclusion reached in the rescission proceedings was erroneous and that in fact she was entitled to her permanent resident status.

The record discloses that petitioner obtained a visa from the Legation of Mexico in Tel Aviv, Israel on July 11, 1958 to go to Mexico City, Mexico and meet her relative there. On July 7, 1958 a Transit visa #TVL-189 was issued to petitioner by the American Embassy at Tel Aviv, Israel. On July 23, 1958 petitioner entered the United States as a non-immigrant through the Port of New York to go in transit to Mexico. [TR. p. 93].



Petitioner had no intention of remaining in the United States when she entered on July 23, 1958. Her sole purpose was to go to Mexico until she saw her sponsor, who was looking for a nurse for his children and offered her a nursing position. She accepted it and worked for her sponsor as a children's nurse. [Pet. p. 3].

A certificate was issued to her by the Tel-Hashomer Hospital showing she had been a registered nurse employed by the hospital in the childrens' ward from 1953 until April, 1958. [Pet. p. 4].

Letters were filed with the Immigration Service attesting to petitioner's contention that she was entitled to her permanent resident status. [TR. pp. 96-100; Vol. II, pp. 7-9].

Fair play requires that semantics not be permitted to thwart common sense or justice. Immigration Service now contends that when it stated "there is no further appeal available" it meant there was no further administrative appeal allowed. However, if that is what the Service meant it should have so stated. Petitioner had a right to believe and did believe, that when she received an official communication from an agency of the United States government stating that "there is no further appeal available", it meant she had exhausted her remedies.

The Service was not required to make the statement;

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

since it took the initiative to make the statement, fairness would require it to inform petitioner that even though there was no further administrative appeal, she had recourse to the courts.

It is clear petitioner was misled, and therefore is entitled to have the matter re-opened so she may exhaust all of her remedies and have her rights protected.

Counsel for petitioner has not been able to find a case in point which would be of assistance to the Court in determining whether the final Order of Deportation is valid under the circumstances which occurred in this situation. Counsel respectfully submits that this Court should establish the principle which will allow a reversal of the Order of the Immigration Service so that a full and complete opportunity will be afforded petitioner to establish her right to remain in the United States as a permanent resident.

To uphold the deportation Order would be an invasion of human rights. She should not be separated from her infant son who is an American citizen and she should not be required to remove her son, an American citizen, from the shores of the United States.

...the ... of ...  
...the ... of ...  
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...  
...the ... of ...  
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...  
...the ... of ...  
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...  
...the ... of ...  
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...  
...the ... of ...  
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...  
...the ... of ...  
...the ... of ...



C O N C L U S I O N

Based on the foregoing principles it is urged that the Court review the decision ordering the deportation of petitioner and that on the review should remand the case to the District Director for further proceedings so that (1) she may establish her right to remain in the United States as a permanent resident and (2) that there may be a court review of the decision revoking her status as a permanent resident.

Respectfully submitted,

MURRAY M. CHOTINER  
PATRICK J. HILLINGS

By: MURRAY M. CHOTINER  
Attorneys for Petitioner.

CERTIFICATION

I certify that, in connection with the preparation of this brief, I have examined Rules 18 and 19 of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and that, in my opinion, the foregoing brief is in full compliance with those rules.

/s/

---

Murray M. Chottiner  
Attorney for Petitioner.

EXHIBIT 10

...the ...  
 ...the ...  
 ...the ...  
 ...the ...  
 ...the ...  
 ...the ...  
 ...the ...  
 ...the ...

...  
 ...  
 ...  
 ...  
 ...

EXHIBIT 11

...the ...  
 ...the ...  
 ...the ...  
 ...the ...  
 ...the ...  
 ...the ...  
 ...the ...  
 ...the ...

...  
 ...  
 ...

	<u>PAGE</u>
EXHIBIT 1	79-80
EXHIBIT 2	81-82
EXHIBIT 3	83
EXHIBIT 4	84-85
EXHIBIT 5	86
EXHIBIT 6	87, 84-85
EXHIBIT 7	88
EXHIBIT 8	89-90
EXHIBIT 9	91-92
EXHIBIT 10	93
EXHIBIT "A"	17, Vol. 15
EXHIBIT "B"	18, Vol. 17
EXHIBIT "C"	19, Vol. 11

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY  
540 EAST 57TH STREET  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637  
TEL: 773-936-3000  
WWW.CHICAGO.LIBRARY.EDU

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY  
540 EAST 57TH STREET  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637  
TEL: 773-936-3000  
WWW.CHICAGO.LIBRARY.EDU

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
LIBRARY

	<u>PAGE</u>
EXHIBIT 1	79-80
EXHIBIT 2	81-82
EXHIBIT 3	83
EXHIBIT 4	84-85
EXHIBIT 5	86
EXHIBIT 6	87; 64-65
EXHIBIT 7	88
EXHIBIT 8	89-90
EXHIBIT 9	92-100
EXHIBIT 10	101
EXHIBIT "A"	17, Vol. II
EXHIBIT "B"	18, Vol. II
EXHIBIT "C"	19, Vol. II

1. 1911  
 2. 1912  
 3. 1913  
 4. 1914  
 5. 1915  
 6. 1916  
 7. 1917  
 8. 1918  
 9. 1919  
 10. 1920  
 11. 1921  
 12. 1922  
 13. 1923  
 14. 1924  
 15. 1925  
 16. 1926  
 17. 1927  
 18. 1928  
 19. 1929  
 20. 1930  
 21. 1931  
 22. 1932  
 23. 1933  
 24. 1934  
 25. 1935  
 26. 1936  
 27. 1937  
 28. 1938  
 29. 1939  
 30. 1940  
 31. 1941  
 32. 1942  
 33. 1943  
 34. 1944  
 35. 1945  
 36. 1946  
 37. 1947  
 38. 1948  
 39. 1949  
 40. 1950  
 41. 1951  
 42. 1952  
 43. 1953  
 44. 1954  
 45. 1955  
 46. 1956  
 47. 1957  
 48. 1958  
 49. 1959  
 50. 1960  
 51. 1961  
 52. 1962  
 53. 1963  
 54. 1964  
 55. 1965  
 56. 1966  
 57. 1967  
 58. 1968  
 59. 1969  
 60. 1970  
 61. 1971  
 62. 1972  
 63. 1973  
 64. 1974  
 65. 1975  
 66. 1976  
 67. 1977  
 68. 1978  
 69. 1979  
 70. 1980  
 71. 1981  
 72. 1982  
 73. 1983  
 74. 1984  
 75. 1985  
 76. 1986  
 77. 1987  
 78. 1988  
 79. 1989  
 80. 1990  
 81. 1991  
 82. 1992  
 83. 1993  
 84. 1994  
 85. 1995  
 86. 1996  
 87. 1997  
 88. 1998  
 89. 1999  
 90. 2000  
 91. 2001  
 92. 2002  
 93. 2003  
 94. 2004  
 95. 2005  
 96. 2006  
 97. 2007  
 98. 2008  
 99. 2009  
 100. 2010

1. 1911  
 2. 1912  
 3. 1913  
 4. 1914  
 5. 1915  
 6. 1916  
 7. 1917  
 8. 1918  
 9. 1919  
 10. 1920  
 11. 1921  
 12. 1922  
 13. 1923  
 14. 1924  
 15. 1925  
 16. 1926  
 17. 1927  
 18. 1928  
 19. 1929  
 20. 1930  
 21. 1931  
 22. 1932  
 23. 1933  
 24. 1934  
 25. 1935  
 26. 1936  
 27. 1937  
 28. 1938  
 29. 1939  
 30. 1940  
 31. 1941  
 32. 1942  
 33. 1943  
 34. 1944  
 35. 1945  
 36. 1946  
 37. 1947  
 38. 1948  
 39. 1949  
 40. 1950  
 41. 1951  
 42. 1952  
 43. 1953  
 44. 1954  
 45. 1955  
 46. 1956  
 47. 1957  
 48. 1958  
 49. 1959  
 50. 1960  
 51. 1961  
 52. 1962  
 53. 1963  
 54. 1964  
 55. 1965  
 56. 1966  
 57. 1967  
 58. 1968  
 59. 1969  
 60. 1970  
 61. 1971  
 62. 1972  
 63. 1973  
 64. 1974  
 65. 1975  
 66. 1976  
 67. 1977  
 68. 1978  
 69. 1979  
 70. 1980  
 71. 1981  
 72. 1982  
 73. 1983  
 74. 1984  
 75. 1985  
 76. 1986  
 77. 1987  
 78. 1988  
 79. 1989  
 80. 1990  
 81. 1991  
 82. 1992  
 83. 1993  
 84. 1994  
 85. 1995  
 86. 1996  
 87. 1997  
 88. 1998  
 89. 1999  
 90. 2000  
 91. 2001  
 92. 2002  
 93. 2003  
 94. 2004  
 95. 2005  
 96. 2006  
 97. 2007  
 98. 2008  
 99. 2009  
 100. 2010